

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 17 June, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In accordance with The Legislative Library Act, I have the honour to present the Annual Report of the Legislative Library and the Provincial Archives for the calendar year ending 1981.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, this is a statement on the Core Area Initiatives Home Repair Program. Mr. Speaker, under the Core Area Initiatives Agreement signed last September a commitment was given regarding the nature of the province's participation in a special program to stimulate housing renovations in the core area of Winnipeg. The details of the program have now been fully worked out and the program is set to commence.

Under the program core area homeowners obtaining loans of up to \$10,000 from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, under the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program, the acronym is RRAP, will qualify for provincial assistance to reduce their effective interest rates down to 0 percent in the case of households with incomes below \$16,500, graduating up to a point per \$1,000 additional income to an effective 9.5 percent rate for households with incomes at or above \$26,000.00. Rental property owners, qualifying under the federal program, will also be eligible for interest reduction grants sufficient to yield an effective 9.5 percent interest rate on loans of up to \$7,500 to a maximum of 10 percentage points of assistance.

Under current RAP guidelines, homeowners in the core area are eligible for up to \$10,000 in home repair loans at National Housing Act interest rates, a portion of which may become earned forgiveness, that is, a grant over a five-year period depending on income.

Grant assistance of up to \$5,000 is available for those with incomes below \$9,000, with declining grant amounts available to those with incomes up to \$16,500 maximum. These homeowners are also eligible for the difference between their grant assistance and \$10,000 in repayable loan. Homeowners with incomes above the \$16,500 level are eligible for repayable loans of up to \$10,000 so long as they are residents of the core area.

Rental property owners are eligible for up to \$2,500 per unit in forgivable loan or grant funding from Cen-

tral Mortgage and Housing Corporation conditional upon their minimal investment of a matching \$2,500.00. Additional loan funding beyond the CMHC assistance must be obtained privately at prevailing bank interest rates. The purpose of the provincial assistance will be to lower effective interest rates on loans from current high levels and thus encourage greater investment in the renovation of core housing stock.

It is anticipated that over the five-year life of the Core Area Agreement some \$30 million in construction repair activity may be stimulated, with capital provided from CMHC and the province and private lenders. The interest reduction grants payable by the province are budgeted at \$7.5 million over the life of the five-year program. Funding from CMHC was committed and publicly announced by the Honourable Paul Cosgrove last year prior to the signing of the Core Area Agreement last September. Also under the agreement, monies were budgeted in the core area fund which is cost-shared by the three level of government as part of the overall program.

This program represents one of the finer examples of the type of co-operative federalism that is still possible when our government set out meaningfully to resolve a problem.

The Federal Housing Minister, Honourable Paul Cosgrove, had in 1981 committed an additional \$1.5 million annually above the historical levels of funding to the City of Winnipeg under the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program.

It is estimated that renovation of some 4,000 units will be facilitated under the program creating some 600-700 man years of work over the life of the Core Area Agreement. The rental property owner component of the program should serve to complement the provisions of Manitoba's new Rental Regulation Act under which units, undergoing extensive renovation, may be exempt from provincial rent controls.

In order to obtain program assistance, landlords will have to agree to CMHC rent controls which seek to ensure that the benefits provided not only increase the habitability of older rental units, but also result in appropriately moderate levels of rent increase.

Historically the take-up of federal RRAP loan funds in the City of Winnipeg has usually fallen short of expectations, particularly in the face of recent high interest rates. It is our hope and expectation that the specially modified program will significantly contribute to the revitalization of housing stock in the Winnipeg core area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We on this side, Mr. Speaker, are pleased that the government is proceeding to implement the Core Area Initiatives Agreement, which we signed last September with the City of Winnipeg and with the Federal Government. I note, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister does cite this as one of the finer examples of the type of co-operative federalism that is still possible.

I must point out for the record, Mr. Speaker, that

when members opposite criticize the manner in which our government dealt with the Federal Government, I remind them that it was our government indeed who participated in, negotiated and signed, the Core Area Initiative Agreement. The announcement today by the Minister, Mr. Speaker, is a part of that agreement, and a part of that plan, and a very important part of that plan, and we on this side look forward to the successful implementation of this program in rehabilitating and renovating homes in the Core Area Initiative, Mr. Speaker. I think it is an excellent program for the central part of the City of Winnipeg, and we look forward to its successful implementation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. R. PENNER introduced Bill No. 63, An Act to amend The Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: May I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 45 students of Grades 5 and 6 standing from the Faraday School under the direction of Mr. Woroby. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

PROCEDURAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, I have a short procedural statement to make to the House.

On Monday, June 14th, during Private Members' Hour, when the Honourable Member for Arthur was speaking, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture rose in his place to state that his policy was being misrepresented and asked the Honourable Member for Arthur to withdraw the remarks.

I took the matter under advisement to review the actual words used.

A Matter of Privilege was addressed to the Chair by the Minister dealing with the same matter which I also took under advisement.

I have perused Hansard of June 14th, and the Estimates debate Hansard where the issue originated.

The dispute between Members is one of partisan political difference. It is an emotional issue and will no doubt continue to be a matter of contention in the future.

Given the divisive nature of the disagreement, it would be preferable if the Chair were not involved and the matter resolved by partisan political debate.

However, there remains the fact that a Matter of Privilege has been raised, which is a serious matter and must be addressed.

It is therefore with considerable reluctance that I conclude that the Honourable Member for Arthur did misrepresent to the House, words that had been used by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture to describe

his land-ownership policy.

The Matter of Privilege Motion thereby becomes redundant.

I must therefore require the Honourable Member for Arthur to withdraw the relevant remark.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, in perusing your ruling, and I have a written copy in front of me, I must say that this raises some very significant problems in terms of the conduct of the House in that interpretations of what one member says, if they can be brought forward as misrepresentation by another, then I believe, Sir, that we will end up with a continuous stream of charges where what a member has said has been misrepresented. There have been many occasions, Sir, where that has happened and it has simply been ruled that a difference of opinion didn't constitute a matter of privilege.

Sir, I must therefore respectfully challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: The ruling of the Chair has been challenged.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members. Order please.

The question before the House is, shall the ruling of the Chair be upheld?

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Messrs. Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Carroll, Corrin, Desjardins, Mrs. Dodick, Messrs. Doern, Ms Dolin, Messrs. Evans, Eyer, Fox, Harapiak, Mrs. Hemphill, Messrs. Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Penner, Ms Phillips, Messrs. Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Uruski, Uskiw.

NAYS

Messrs. Banman, Brown, Downey, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay, Mrs. Hammond, Messrs. Hyde, Johnston, Lyon, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Mrs. Oleson, Messrs. Orchard, Ransom, Sherman, Steen.

MR. ACTING CLERK, G. Mackintosh: Yeas, 26; Nays, 19.

MR. SPEAKER: The ruling of the Chair is accordingly upheld.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect, and I think the further review of the comments made on that particular date, Mr. Speaker, on the comments that I'd made following your comment here, Sir, with the greatest respect I do not feel that I should withdraw comments.

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask the Honourable Member for Arthur to review what he has said and the statement that has been put before him, and consider whether it wouldn't be the best course of action for himself and for the House and for the topic involved to withdraw those remarks as requested on the day that they were made and as requested by the Chair today.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I wasn't clear, again with the greatest of respect, Sir, I do not plan to withdraw those remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur has been in the Chamber long enough to know the destination which he will arrive at by his remarks.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Sorry, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how far you've proceeded . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I believe I have asked the Honourable Member for Arthur twice to follow the direction of the Chair, which is to withdraw the remarks that he made that were objected to on Monday. If he does not intend to do so, then I must reluctantly name the Honourable Member for Arthur, Mr. James Downey, for defying the order of the Chair.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the rules, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that the Honourable Member for Arthur be suspended from the sitting of this House for the balance of this day.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance as a member of the now defunct Alcan negotiating team, can the Minister of Finance tell this House when the Government became aware of the announcement that was made public today that Alcan has purchased some 2,200 acres of land in the Province of Quebec in anticipation of the construction at a later date, not yet named, of a 250,000 tonne smelter as a partial replacement for the Arvida Smelter at the same time, or two days I should say, after Alcan had announced in Manitoba that it was giving up all options to purchase land and that all negotiations were suspended indefinitely, keeping in mind as well that Alcan's announcement today, Sir, has said that Quebec Environment Council has approved of the location of the smelter at that site and that all of the other requisite approvals have been made by the Government of Quebec, unlike what has been done by this Government in Manitoba? When did this government become aware of that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only speak for myself, I was aware as of Monday of this week that Alcan was intending to proceed with the purchase of that particular land. They had options on it. Alcan officials indicated to us —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the member asks a question which is important to Manitobans, I would ask that the Member for Lakeside permit me to answer it.

Alcan has written to us and they indicated that - in fact they provided us with an excerpt from their 1981 Annual Report to their employees, and I quote, it's one brief paragraph: "Another internal development was the further clarification of our strategy for smelter expansion and rebuilding. In this area our priorities are now firmly established. The modernization and revitalization of our existing Canadian facilities must proceed in an orderly manner over the remainder of this century. Expansion opportunities must be viewed in the context of this modernization commitment. These modernization and production expansion strategies predicated on our ownership of hydro-electric power stations remain intact. However, the timing of significant projects will have to be delayed as a result of current financial constraints."

Now, the point is, Mr. Speaker, that the plant, which they are intending at some time in the future to replace, is one that was built in the 1920's. This is not something which will provide them with an additional plant in that it is a replacement to an old plant which they must replace.

So, yes, we were informed of this; I was informed of it on Monday of this week.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, given that the paragraph in question from Alcan's 1981 Annual Report to its employees was read by me to this House approximately a week or 10 days ago, and the words that have just been read by the Minister of Finance, "These modernization and production expansion strategies predicated on our ownership of hydro-electric power stations remain intact"; given that those words were in the report of 1981; given that that is the policy of Alcan; given the fact that Alcan has now pulled up bag and baggage from Manitoba without taking up the options, without signing a hydro rate agreement, without signing a Memorandum of Understanding with the government, will this government not now reconsider its ill-considered policy of saying to Alcan that it would under no circumstances sell part of a Hydro Generating Plant to Alcan for the purpose of getting that industry in our province?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, what the Leader of the Opposition forgets is that very statement says that their first priority is the replacement of existing plant. That is what they're going on with. But even with that objective, the announcement by Alcan says very specifically, "A decision on actual construction will be made at a later date." Even though they are required to replace an old plant, because of the recession, because of the fact that in the United States plants are at about 45 percent of operating capacity, because of prices, they are not proceeding with construction down there, but there is no question that they will have to replace that plant. They had already had these options on the land, as I understand it, for a couple of years.

They had to replace it; this had to be a priority for them above new expansion and that was their policy in 1981; it is their policy now. They are not proceeding with other new plants. There is a partially built plant in Australia that they stopped construction on.

So, Mr. Speaker, for the Opposition to suggest that somehow it is because of a failure on the part of this government, that the company is doing precisely what it was saying when that group was in office, well, that's just plain nonsense.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the Alcan Aluminum have taken up the option to buy 2,200 acres of land in Quebec, whereas 48 hours ago they announced they were giving up the option to buy some 4,000 acres in Manitoba; given the fact that in Quebec, Alcan has got approval from the Environmental Council to proceed with the smelter location there at a time and date when they choose to do so; given the fact that in Manitoba this government stopped the environmental studies that were under way - the socioeconomic studies that were under way - how can this Minister stand in the House, Mr. Speaker, and say that Manitoba is in no worse position today than it was six months ago? Who is he trying to kid, Mr. Speaker?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition says we stopped studies of the environmental impacts of a proposed plant. That, of course, is inaccurate as is the rest of his statement which is not very similar to a question. Now suddenly we are asked to table the studies that are in place. We and Alcan - I don't have the statement here but they know full well - they met with Alcan on Monday or Tuesday morning. They know full well that Alcan is intending to continue with the studies with the Manitoba Government over the next few months to completion of those studies, so that it will be in place for some time in the future beyond their current planning range when they may decide to build another smelter, but until they decide to build a new capacity smelter, not a replacement for their Arvida plant, all they are going to do is complete the studies. To suggest that the studies were terminated by us is simply incorrect; they are not being terminated.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, given the fact again that our government, before it left office, had provided through public advertisements and through preparatory work of some several months, arrangements for socioeconomic and environmental studies, public hearings on them to take place starting the 1st of April, 1982, can this Minister stand in his place in the House and say that his government did not cancel those studies that were based upon the Balmoral site; can he stand in his place and say that his government was not asking Alcan to review the site and that those did not contribute to the fact that Alcan did not take up the options in Manitoba?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I can, on the absolute authority of people from Alcan. The President of Alcan clearly told us that they're not proceeding had absolutely nothing to do with the change in government, or the manner in which negotiations were carried on

after December, 1981.

For the Leader of the Opposition to suggest — (Interjection) — ah, the Member for Lakeside is saying, what do you expect them to say? Is he calling the man a liar?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Finance not able to confirm to this House what the world at large knows, namely, that the Manitoba Environment Commission had been commissioned to start public hearings on the Balmoral site; do an indepth environmental and socioeconomic study starting on the 1st of April, 1982; and that those plans were stopped by this government as it fooled around and tried to convince Alcan about other sites and about its ideas about Hydro generation and all sorts of tomfoolery that it brought to the negotiating table which, Sir, has resulted in the sad state of affairs that we find today? Quebec's going to get something sooner than Manitoba.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, last fall the now Leader of the Opposition was creating the kind of expectations that his former Minister of Energy was creating last spring and I would remind the House of last spring's announcement.

In May, when they were expecting a spring election, when they were thinking of a spring election, they were telling us about the shaft being dug already by fall in McAuley and that sort of thing. In the fall, yes, they commissioned some hearings with respect to the Balmoral site. We said, during the election campaign, that we wanted to ensure that we had the best site. We wanted to ensure that all alternatives had been explored. There was concern expressed by Manitobans. Manitobans spoke on November 17th. Manitobans agreed with us that there should be studies, not only of the one site, but of alternatives that there might be. We followed through on that commitment.

Notwithstanding our following through on that commitment, Alcan has made it very clear that it is not because of a change of government that they have made the announcement that they made, but rather because of the continued recession.

The members of the Opposition, I'm sure, have seen the tables that Alcan presented. One that I would especially commend to the Leader of the Opposition's attention is the Chase Econometrics Predictions going back about two years, and every few months they'd make a new prediction showing that the upturn in the market was just around the corner - we kept seeing the check marks - and each time a few more months went by the predictions went down, the slide continued, and that is why they made the announcement that they made.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, given the fact that in this House within the last two weeks the First Minister of this province and the Minister of Mines and Energy who is, or was at that time, in charge of negotiations with Alcan, both said that negotiations were going well - going well indeed - and there were no problems with the Alcan development, how can this Minister

stand in his place today and say that the former government was raising false expectations? Mr. Speaker, will the Minister not confirm that under the former government, Alcan took out options to buy land; under this government, they give up the options? Isn't that a sufficient contrast?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I recall the Premier of this province within the last few weeks making statements about the difficulties in the market. I recall the Minister of Energy and Mines making statements about the difficulties with respect to the market. The suggestion that they were sitting here and saying that they expected a plant to grow up without those qualifications, then it may be that, taken out of context, the Leader of the Opposition has some statement somewhere saying that negotiations are going as well as might be expected.

Surely that has to be taken in context with the statements that the Premier, and the Minister of Energy and Mines made in total to this House, and to the Committees of this House. The Leader of the Opposition spent hours talking with the Premier and with the Minister of Energy and Mines about the various sets of negotiations and within those discussions there were a number of times when it was made very clear that the fact that market conditions are what they are plays on the decisions of corporations as to when they are going to start building.

Again I point out to the Leader of the Opposition the fact that this very same company; No. 1, is not giving a date for proceeding with reconstruction of an existing plant that's 60 years old or so in Quebec; and No. 2, has ceased construction on a plant in another country which was already under way because of market conditions.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Finance unable to appreciate the fundamental difference between Manitoba's position today vis-a-vis an Alcan smelter and its position six months ago? Is the Minister of Finance standing in his place today, Mr. Speaker, and telling us that Manitoba would not have been better off if those options had been taken up, the land purchased in anticipation of when the site could be built, the Hydro Agreement and the Memorandum of Understanding signed? My question, Mr. Speaker, is why did his government not move ahead with those negotiations, which were well down the road, and bring them at least to that point of completion so that when Alcan is able to build it would be building in Manitoba? Can he tell us that?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, if they already had an agreement why didn't we have Alcan committed to build it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Finance this question which is something that I think should be within his knowledge. The prospectus that his government issued, that he authorized on behalf of the Government of Manitoba in March, wherein it said in the prospectus that Alcan was negotiating with the

Province of Manitoba for the establishment of a smelter, is he now trying to say that the statement he made in the prospectus was a lie?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is back into that. First of all - and I wish that he would take the time to read when he doesn't come to the various committee meetings - that he would read what was said about prospectuses. That prospectus was prepared some time in very early December, 1981. It was in New York - although it's dated I believe the 15th or 16th of December or something like that - initially it was in New York and vetted between the time it was signed and that date.

Secondly, it was a shelf registration which was updated with a later prospectus, later on, at which time the Underwriters were informed of the fact that there was an agreement to agree - which I had indicated previously didn't commit Alcan to building - an agreement to agree which had expired; they were informed of that, they felt that was not a worthwhile enough, a significant enough event for a change in the prospectus for the province.

We certainly have no quarrel with the position taken by the Underwriters. They didn't see that as significant, for instance, a further decrease in the amount of revenue that we were going to be receiving from Hydro, because those were facts. This was something that is maybe some time in the future. This was something that was maybe in the future. —(Interjection)— Well, the Member for Lakeside, if he has some questions, maybe he would like to stand up and put them on the record instead of sitting there and talking from his seat.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Honourable Minister of Finance if he really thinks he's fooling anybody in Balmoral today?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Finance if I heard him right when I heard him say that he was putting some question upon the words that were placed in the prospectus of the Province of Manitoba by him and his government, and that prospectus was dated, as he said, the 15th of December, 1981 when, in fact, on the supplement to the prospectus from which we've been reading lo these many weeks, the date of this prospectus supplement is March 8, 1982? Now is he trying to tell the House and trying to tell the people of Manitoba that on March 8th, 1982, he still thought that the Alcan thing was just a bunch of election promises?

If so, why did he on March 8, 1982, tell the people who loaned the Province of Manitoba \$200 million, that this government was still pursuing a Memorandum of Understanding with Alcan, if he thought in the words of his cheap shot today, that it really wasn't happening and that the previous government was just raising expectations?

Is he trying to peddle that kind of nonsense to the House, to the people of Manitoba, to the investors,

and indeed to Alcan? Is he trying to say, that represents integrity in negotiating? Mr. Speaker, I want him to answer about the integrity of this government and the ability of this government to be trusted with any negotiation.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I should, just to put it on the record for today from page 7 of the prospectus: "Under a Letter of Intent between the Aluminum Company of Canada Limited, Alcan, and the province, Alcan has commenced a feasibility study for the construction of a \$500 million primary aluminum production and processing plant in the province. Alcan has announced the selection of a site approximately 25 miles, northwest of Winnipeg and is conducting environmental and socioeconomic studies." That's what we've had.

There was a feasibility study. The feasibility study was surely still going on and was going on until a week ago. I regret, just like all other Manitobans do, the decision that Alcan had to take. The decision that Alcan had to take was because of market conditions. Alcan said that to the public of Manitoba. It is not difficult to understand why they are taking that position when you look at market conditions in the world.

In March of 1982, those feasibility studies were continuing; there was certainly nothing incorrect about that statement. That they are not now continuing completely is regrettable, although even now Alcan is completing the studies, together with the government, that were commenced - and they expect that it will take another couple of months - and Alcan has stated publicly that it is its intention to continue liaison with the Government of Manitoba in order that any future developments may be monitored by both Alcan and the government of this province.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, it's the Minister of Finance who has to choose his position. Either the Alcan plant was just an election promise, as he was alleging a few moments ago in this House, or the Alcan plant was something that was real and happening in Manitoba until this group of incompetent people came into government. Now he's got a choice to make —(Interjection)—

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to be hooted down by the Attorney-General. He may find that tactic suitable having regard to his previous political affiliations, but they don't work in here.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Attorney-General on a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes. I have no intention of hooting down the Leader of the Opposition, he makes a fool of himself and a mockery of this House by his own remarks. But I do call your attention to a ruling that you made in this House with respect to the long rambling preambles that do not lead to a question, and the Leader of the Opposition is now proceeding to do that, and I direct that you remind him of your ruling on this question, dated June 16, 1982.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable the Attorney-General, and I'm sure that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will take note of those statements that

were made as to the length of questions.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Finance then tell the House, given the fact that his government confirmed that there were real negotiations going on as late as March 8, 1982 - if we can believe anything this government says now - will he tell the House when he intends to have the Manitoba Environment Commission resume the discussions and resume the public hearings on the site at Balmoral, the hearings that were cancelled by this government, what date are they going to start them up again?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition in the first half of the question seemed to assume that there is nothing in between, a firm agreement or nothing. I pointed out that there was no firm agreement in November of 1981 when we came to office. When we came to office there was an agreement to possibly agree in the future. We have worked along with that agreement.

It is true that after November of 1981, we suggested that we wanted the issue of location reopened to look at whether Balmoral was the only site, that is very true but certainly there was no agreement to build - if there had been I'm sure that Alcan would have started building - there was no such agreement, so what we did from that point on was negotiate in good faith precisely in accordance with the mandate which we received from the people of Manitoba, because we told the people of Manitoba before the election that we were not prepared to agree to a site without looking at the ramifications to the environment of the city and surrounding areas, and the farmlands surrounding it and they agreed. We were going to look at other sites in order that any hearing would not just confine itself to one site, but to determine which site was the best site. —(Interjection)— Well, we have a blow-hard in the back seat there who says, you blew it. You know about blowing. We told the people of Manitoba what we were going to do and that is precisely what we went ahead and did.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Finance now confirm that in addition to telling the people of Manitoba during the election campaign about their funny ideas about site location, they also said that the NDP would not, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, do we have to be hooted by juvenile voices from the backbenches?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think the people of Thompson know what's funny about their representative without my having to tell them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Finance not now confirm that his party in election also said that they would never sell a portion of a hydro-

electric plant to Alcan? Did they not say that during the election? Is he trying now to say that is not a contributing factor to the situation, the sad sad situation, we find today, where that company is buying land in the Province of Quebec, and it's giving up options that it took a year ago in Manitoba, in this province?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, again, just to correct the record. The options had been in place for some time in the Province of Quebec. It's not as though they were just jumping at them now as a result of an election. Also, the policy of Alcan was in effect before the election, and again, the policy was; first, to renew its old plant and equipment; secondly, to go into new sites. The question that our policy, which is on the public record and is policy which the people of this province agree with, our policy did not drive them out of this province. They have said very clearly themselves that our policy was not the problem, the problem is world markets. Surely the Leader of the Opposition wouldn't suggest that it's because of the Manitoba NDP that they shut down construction of a new site. —(Interjection)— Surely they aren't blaming the Manitoba NDP for the fact that Alcan has shut down construction on an Australian site; or are they? I'm sure that if they had some way of hanging that on us, they would too.

But in their statements they are ignoring the facts; they are ignoring what we have said and they are also ignoring what the President of Alcan has said.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Finance confirm that this statement was the policy, and remains the policy, of the New Democratic Party and Government of Manitoba, a policy published in "A Clear Choice for Manitobans," policies of the Manitoba New Democratic Party? This statement, and I quote directly from their statement, "The NDP will not allow Alcan ownership of a hydro-electric plant."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I remind honourable members this is question period; it is not a shouting match.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I read that one statement of the New Democratic Party and asked the Minister if that was the policy and I read back to him the words that he read from his own mouth today on Alcan's policy. "These modernization . . ." —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. S. LYON: Given the verbal contortions of the Minister of Finance, he is liable to be able to read with his mouth because he doesn't do anything else with the regular organs.

Mr. Speaker, contrast that statement with this statement that he has just read, Alcan's statement, reading from their statement to their employees, "These modernization and production expansion strategies predicated on our ownership of hydro-electric power stations remain intact." Given the NDP statement on the one hand that they won't allow them

to buy in; Alcan's statement on the other hand that they have to buy in; can the Minister stand in this House and honestly tell the people of Manitoba that the policies of the NDP have not contributed to Alcan's announcement the other day that they are postponing everything in Manitoba and we are back to square one? At the same time, they are buying land in the Province of Quebec.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: The Leader of the Opposition, of course, is saying in effect that the leadership of Alcan is lying when it says that it is not because of a change in government that they have decided to postpone any plans for a smelter operation in Manitoba —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek, I caught a smile on his face. I take it that means he's being sincere for a change with his speaking from his seat, but he can't get away from the fact that Alcan said that it was not the Government of Manitoba or its policies that made them decide what they decided the other day, no more than it was the Government of Manitoba and its policies that made Alcan decide to stop construction of a plant in Australia. It is the economy that is causing that fact to occur. That is something that we hope, I'm sure members on that side and on our side, will turn around. They are as well aware as we are that the aluminum produced will have to be exported in large part and we will have to receive the world price for it. As long as you have American smelters operating at 45 percent of capacity you won't have a great number of companies jumping in to say, we want to build another smelter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my questions are for the Minister of Finance. Has the Minister of Finance established a special fund into which he will place the revenues raised by the payroll tax, the fund for education and health?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: It's going into a well-established fund, the Consolidated Fund.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Finance then to confirm that he has designated this payroll tax as a special education and health levy, but he is not planning to designate those funds for health and education.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the honourable member that as long as we are in government we will be using those funds and many, many, many more dollars for health and post-secondary education.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the rapidly declining Canadian dollar and the burgeoning effect that is going to have on the debt-servicing costs of the province and on the value of the outstanding debt, will the Minister of Finance be establishing a special fund to take care of the retirement of the increased debt which the province will suffer as a consequence to the declining dollar?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, when the Member for Pembina is finished —(Interjection)— just back to the previous question, I had wanted to point out to the member when I got up, I forgot, but I'm sure he has seen the McLeod Young Weir Report on the Budget and there is a quote on the second page of it, "The revenue measures display a sound sense of equity and economic judgment. No particular segment of Manitoba society will be burdened by the higher consumption, income or corporate taxes. The new levy on employers' payrolls is a particularly astute measure that will directly compensate for reduced federal transfers while at the same time permitting relatively low sales and small business taxes to be left untouched." I thought that was an excellent quote from an organization that ordinarily isn't a supporter of the New Democratic Party.

We will do what we can to ensure that our debt is taken care of in an orderly fashion. I would point out to the member that, in terms of some of our foreign debt, our dollar has in fact, over the last short while, strengthened against some currencies in which we also have some exposure.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions having expired, Orders of the Day.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, may I announce some committee membership changes? With respect to Law Amendments, the Member for Inkster will be replacing the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Member for Gimli will be replacing the Member for Concordia.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed)

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: May I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery on my left where Marshall Gomez, who was the former President of Portugal, is here.

On behalf of all the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call Second Readings on Bill No. 50, followed by Bill No. 54, both standing in the name of the Minister of Agriculture.

SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS BILL NO. 50 - THE CROWN LANDS ACT

HON. B. URUSKI presented Bill No. 50, An Act to amend The Crown Lands Act and The Municipal Assessment Act, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of these amendments in Bill No. 50 is to allow all types of agricultural Crown land leases to be administered in the same manner when it comes to collecting and remitting taxes to local municipalities.

At present, with all of our leases, with the exception of the cash rental leases, property taxes are added to the annual lease fee and collected in advance before the summer season. The taxes, so collected, are then turned over to the local taxing authority generally by June or July of each year. By administering leases in this manner the department collects the taxes and refunds them to the local authorities. However, under the present legislation, the local municipal taxing authority is responsible for collecting taxes on our cash rental leases. As a consequence, when these lands are in tax arrears the local municipality has no way to realize on these arrears through tax sales since the lands belong to the Crown. Some local taxing authorities are currently holding considerable tax arrears and penalties on their books as a result of this system.

The proposed amendments contained in Bill 50 would correct this situation and allow all cash rental leases to be administered in the same manner as the rest of the agricultural leases. In this way, all local governments would be assured that their taxes on all agricultural Crown lands in their areas would be kept in a current position and not allowed to get in a position of arrears.

I should also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that although this bill states that all monies collected in lieu of taxes must be paid to the local taxing authority by December 31st of each year, in actual fact, the department does administer these leases in such a way that this money is turned over to the local authority much earlier in the year and I would like to assure members that this practice will be continued in the future.

Mr. Speaker, basically that is, in essence, the principle of the bill and I recommend that this bill, through the members of the House, can be proceeded with and handled in Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina that debate on this bill be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 54 - THE FARM LANDS OWNERSHIP ACT

HON. B. URUSKI presented Bill No. 54, The Farm Lands Ownership Act, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to say that I'm certainly pleased to have the opportunity to present Bill 54, to enact The Farm Lands Ownership Act for Second Reading.

This legislation is intended to support the development of agriculture on rural communities by restricting absentee ownership of Manitoba's farmlands. Before outlining the main provisions of the bill, I intend to describe the objectives underlying this administration's policies with respect to agricultural and rural development.

Mr. Speaker, we, as a government, are committed to preserve the family farm as the basis of Manitoba's agricultural industry. We are committed to increase and stabilize farmers' incomes. We are committed to provide an opportunity for producers, including younger and beginning farmers, to enter agriculture and to develop viable farm units. As well, we wish to provide an option for individuals to live and work in the region of their choice, to conserve the province's land resource base and preserve the environment, and we are committed, Mr. Speaker, to maintain and build a strong viable rural community. I am confident that The Farm Lands Ownership Act will contribute to the achievement of these objectives.

I share the concerns expressed about absentee ownership by organizations like the Manitoba Farm Bureau, the National Farmers Union and the Women's Institute. Research conducted at the University of Manitoba shows that in 1977, approximately 1.8 million acres, or 10 percent of the province's farmland, was owned by absentee landlords. During the period of 1978 to 1981, the years of the previous Conservative administration, absentee ownership expanded substantially. My staff advised that in this period about 250,000 acres of farmland were purchased by individuals who were nonresidents of Manitoba, and an additional 200,000 acres were acquired by investor corporations, many of which are simply fronts for foreign investors.

I'm deeply concerned, Sir, about the problems and the costs associated with speculation in farmland and these costs include the following: land prices are increased thereby increasing the operating costs of all farmers; rising land prices inhibit smaller producers from expanding their operations and prevent younger and beginning farmers from entering agriculture.

Since leases between absentee landlords and tenants are typically very short-term or indefinite in duration, they do not encourage sound farm planning or the use of effective soil conservation practices and, as well, absentee owners drain revenues from local farmers and communities. These are the monies that could otherwise be used to improve incomes of farm families and build strong rural communities.

As well, these costs include the consolidation of smaller family farm units into large ones and we have examples whereby there have been purchases of farmland in - and I'll share one example with the honourable members - a total in excess of 6,000 acres in adjoining municipalities were purchased by a corporation and when they came to the board they freely admitted that their intent was to set up a large corporate operation and of course hire management and have corporate ownership. Really, in effect, Mr.

Speaker, the members of the Conservative Party who talked about state farms purely in the corporate sense, one could relate that very well. I think members of the Conservative Party certainly wouldn't disagree with that.

Mr. Speaker, my expectation is that our legislation, by restricting land speculation and absentee ownership, will reduce these problems very substantially. It won't eliminate them, but it will reduce them.

The main provisions of The Farm Lands Ownership Act are: individual farmers, family farm corporation, and residents of Manitoba generally will be permitted, without restriction, to purchase farmland in Manitoba. Nonresidents of Manitoba and nonfarm corporations will be allowed to acquire up to only 10 acres of farmland. The Farm Lands Ownership Board, established to administer the Act, will be authorized to exempt certain individuals or groups of individuals on a case-by-case basis.

The legislation will take effect on the date of proclamation and thus will not be retroactive. Nonresidents of Manitoba and nonfarm corporations will not be required to divest existing holdings, however, they will not be allowed to expand them above the 10-acre limit.

Mr. Speaker, in my view this legislation is effective, reasonable and fair. By eliminating land purchases by nonresidents of Manitoba who have no intention of taking up residency here; and by eliminating acquisitions by investor corporations, our legislation will effectively remove a major source of speculative pressure from the farmland market.

I should point out that Manitoba is following the lead taken by the provinces of Prince Edward Island, Quebec and Saskatchewan in allowing only provincial residents to make unrestricted purchases of farmland. With reference to corporations, my position is that only family farm corporations - and that is corporations which are effectively controlled by farmers in this province - should be permitted unlimited purchases.

The decision to restrict purchases made by investor corporations has been motivated in part by the concerns expressed by many individuals and by organizations such as the Manitoba Farm Bureau, the National Farmers Union and the Women's Institute. It is generally recognized that in recent years the corporate entity has often been used as a device to conceal the identity of the actual purchasers of farmland and, more specifically, to circumvent the existing Agricultural Lands Protection Act.

The organizations which I referred to, Mr. Speaker, advised the previous Minister of Agriculture, as they have advised me, to place restrictions on purchases by investor corporations. Unfortunately, the previous Minister did not heed their advice in this matter. The consequence is that corporate acquisitions have increased significantly over the past four years; 24,000 acres were purchased by nonfarm corporations in 1978. Approximately 50,000 acres were acquired in 1979 and 1980, respectively, by these same corporations. But in 1981, the year of the amendments that we passed in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, 76,000 acres were secured.

Mr. Speaker, much of this land, I might add, is prime agricultural land. While nonfarm corporations may

have enjoyed a heyday in recent years, let me assure you and all members here that those days are over. This source of speculative pressure on farmland will be removed.

In addition to being effective, I believe that our legislation is reasonable. As I have indicated, all Manitobans without restriction will be able to purchase land in the province. The Farm Lands Ownership Board will also be authorized to grant exemptions to various groups of prospective buyers. Hutterite colonies, for example, will be exempted from any restrictions because they are a corporate entity in the way their structure goes. Similarly, nonresidents of Manitoba, including Canadians and non-Canadians, will be exempt on condition that they commit themselves to take up residency here.

I wish to emphasize that, as a government, we support and encourage individuals from other provinces in Canada and from other countries, to take up residency in Manitoba and become part of our farm and rural community. Those who plan to do so will have no difficulty with this legislation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe that Bill 54, a bill to enact The Farm Lands Ownership Act is fair. While nonfarm corporations and nonresidents of Manitoba will not be allowed in the future to increase their aggregate holdings above the 10-acre limit, they will be permitted to retain their existing holdings. We are saying, in effect, that the rules governing land purchases will be changed. Those who secured land in the past, through other rules and other laws which were in force, will not be penalized for taking advantage of those rules and adhering to them.

Furthermore, it should be observed that a special exemption will be extended to retired farmers; that is, individuals who have farmed in Manitoba for 10 years or more who take up residency elsewhere. My feeling is that these individuals have provided a valuable contribution to agriculture and to society in general. Thus, upon retiring from farming, they will be allowed to maintain their holdings even if they take up residency in another province or another country.

As I stated earlier, Mr. Speaker, I am certainly pleased to present this bill to members of the Assembly by restricting, Mr. Speaker, absentee ownership of our most precious material resource, namely, farmland. I am confident that future price increases in land will be moderated; that the position of the owner-operator will be strengthened; that the outflow of rental payments from rural Manitoba will be substantially reduced.

Mr. Speaker, as well, I'd like to point out to honourable members, last year in May when we debated amendments to the previous Bill No. 58, an Act with many proposed amendments to The Agricultural Lands Protection Act, at that time I made a statement, recorded in Hansard, that no matter how many amendments the Minister would bring into this House, it would never control foreign and nonresident ownerships. We have said that the only way to have effective legislation was to move to the basis of resident Manitoba ownership. We mentioned that many Canadian corporations were being set up legally to circumvent the present legislation. We made the plea for strong farmlands protection legislation in Manitoba to decrease absentee ownership, particularly

from these investor corporations. We've had some opportunity to assess the actual situation from a review of the Agricultural Lands Protection Board records and with the advice of legal counsel. Mr. Speaker, the advice from legal counsel to us was that if we were to provide an effective piece of legislation, we should start all over again and rewrite the Act. That's what we have done.

The first point to be covered was to have an Act that would be constitutionally sound. Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of many distinguished lawyers, the previous Statute, and coming from a Conservative Administration, would not likely have stood up to a constitutional challenge. It was unconstitutional, Mr. Speaker, in the eyes of many legal people. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the honourable members of this Chamber on the advice that I have received - I've checked with legal counsel - provinces under The BNA Act have no authority to regulate rights of nonresidents of Canada. But under the BNA, matters relating to naturalization and aliens falls under federal jurisdiction.

The Federal Government have extended to provinces the right to restrict acquisition of property by nonresidents under Section 33 of The Citizenship Act. Sub-sections 33(2) and 33(6) were proclaimed in force in Manitoba on January 4th, 1980. However, in contrast to Alberta legislation, the powers to regulate foreign acquisitions were never incorporated into The Agricultural Lands Protection Act as regulations. I am advised that the Act would have had to be completely redrafted to accommodate these regulations.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the honourable members that in Section 2 of the Alberta legislation, they have followed that advice, contrary to the previous administration here. Here I quote Section 2: "Subject to Section 3, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make regulations within the Legislative Authority of the province and complementary to any regulations that he makes pursuant to Section 33 of The Citizenship Act, Canada, for the purpose of prohibiting, annulling, or in any manner restricting or taking or acquisition directly or indirectly or any succession to any interest in controlled land."

Mr. Speaker, had the previous administration followed that advice and placed those amendments in their legislation, that Act would have been and could have been constitutionally sound. Mr. Speaker, they did not even pass a piece of legislation that would have withstood a constitutional test.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go on to our legislation which I said was modeled on the legislation of Prince Edward Island, Quebec, and Saskatchewan. In fact, I want to quote to honourable members a Supreme Court ruling of a 1975 challenge of the Prince Edward Island legislation, Morgan versus the Province of PEI. I will quote from, I believe it's Page 8 of the federal ruling, one paragraph that was written by the learned justices on this matter: "I do not agree with this characterization and I do not think it is supportable either in principle or under any case law. No one is prevented by Prince Edward Island legislation from entering the province and from taking up residence there. Absentee ownership of land in the province is a matter of legitimate provincial concern. In the case of Prince Edward Island, history adds force to this aspect of its authority over its territory." That was the Supreme

Court ruling, Mr. Speaker. We have basically modeled and followed our legislation on, not only the rulings of legislation, but in fact the policies which we advocated and stood and proclaimed to the people of the Province of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, my view then is that the legislative measures outlined in Bill No. 54 will contribute significantly to the preservation and strengthening of the family farm, to the development of the agricultural industry and to the establishment of strong viable rural communities. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the debate on this bill.

Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER, H. Harapiak: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you call the Adjourned Debate, Second Reading, Bill No. 21?

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 21 - THE COMMUNITY CHILD DAY CARE STANDARDS ACT

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of Honourable Minister of Community Services, Bill No. 21, The Community Child Day Care Standards Act, standing in the name of The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My comments will be relatively brief on this bill, Mr. Speaker. I've noted in the debates that have taken place on this bill and comments from the members on the government side that somehow there seemed to be a feeling that the concept of day care and the need for day care was not generally accepted by both parties, or by all members of the House. Mr. Speaker, I should think that would have been well established by this time and, indeed, that the need for day care is no longer a debatable issue. That has been demonstrated, of course, by the record of our government during the four years that we were in government and the extent that funding was increased for day care during that period of time. So this is not an area that is simply in the purview of the New Democratic Party Government.

In this day and age of greater participation of women in the work force, hence leading to working mothers, we find that there is a requirement for day care that is growing at a rate even beyond that which the supply of day care space is being expanded. I quote some information from the brief which was just presented by the Conference of Manitoba and

Northwestern Ontario, United Church of Canada where they said that in 1975 there were 562,000 children under the age of six with mothers in the labour force; by 1980, this number had risen to 760,000 children. During that same period of time, in 1975, the difference between the spaces provided and the requirement was 492,000 and in 1980, the difference was 650,000-and-some.

So during that period of time, the requirement for day care has increased beyond the expansion of the number of places even though there have been substantially more funds go into this area. Clearly, the great need is to try and accommodate the real requirements that people have. To me, that would seem to be the first requirement, Mr. Speaker, that we have to try and meet those demands.

There is also though a need for some satisfactory standards to be met and, of course, that is what the government is attempting to do by introducing this bill. But as some of my colleagues have said, this bill really does not tell us very much about what their intentions are with respect to standards of day care. We had been led to believe, of course, that when the bill was introduced we would know then what the government's attitude was towards standards; exactly how they would implement the standards; what impact they might have on existing day care operations and what the costs might be, that sort of thing.

Mr. Speaker, because that isn't in the bill now, all we have is a bill that is going to enable the government to go ahead and do things behind closed doors, if they wish. If they wish to do it openly, that option is open to them too, Mr. Speaker, but they can go ahead and do it behind closed doors. There is no indication of what those regulations actually will be and my concern would be, what is going to happen to the existing organizations, the existing volunteers that are involved in providing day care now.

There is a very real danger when we see the actions taken by this government opposite with respect to the provision of security services, for instance, where the action of the government was to take people into the government, to hire civil servants to do it and thereby increase the costs substantially. There was an Order for Return just filed in the past few days, Mr. Speaker, which indicates the tremendous increase in the cost to the government as a consequence of hiring — (Interjection)— yes, a cost, I said a cost to the government, Mr. Speaker. Actually, of course, that's a cost to the people and not to the government, but that's an indication of what we can expect from this government.

So I would be concerned, in the establishment of their regulations and their standards, that they are going to move to create a huge bureaucracy; that they are going to take what is acknowledged to be an important area that has been handled to the extent that it's been handled very well by the existing people who have been involved. I can see that this government will be moving to turn this into essentially a Civil Service function and that they will be replacing, in some cases, volunteers with civil servants.

Mr. Speaker, I can only urge the Minister and the government that they resist that temptation, because we keep hearing comments to the effect that day care is being provided on the backs of those people who

are now working in day care; an indication in some cases that standards will be such that they'll require highly educated people, perhaps even people that would want to unionize and deal more effectively with their employers in this way. No doubt, the costs will greatly increase as a consequence.

At a time, Mr. Speaker, that the demand appears to be outstripping the supply, it would seem to me to be prudent to concentrate on meeting the demand and not do anything that is going to cause excessive and unnecessary increases in the costs, because the government is then going to be faced, not only with meeting the increasing demand, but they are going to have to meet higher costs at the same time. I know that the Minister of Community Services, despite the stated intentions of his government, is going to have trouble getting funds for his department. He is going to have trouble getting funds for this area specifically, even though there have been statements made that acknowledge the requirement for greater funding.

Mr. Speaker, I think one other thing that I would like to stress to the Minister - and this is within his capacity to do, he can do it on his own; I don't think he would even need to consult with his colleagues - is that before he passes the regulations which will be law, he should make certain that the public has an opportunity to have input into those regulations, that there is an opportunity for widespread discussions. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that when the Minister closes debate on this issue that he will give the assurance to the House that is what he will do; that he will not simply pass regulations on the basis of one or two closed-door discussions with some of his favorite advisory groups, but that he will have open discussion and a chance for the public to see what he's passing.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other item that I would also like to mention here, is that the members opposite have had a great, I would go so far as to say, hangup about the provision of day care by the private sector. This is something that I find rather curious that at the same time as they are talking about implementing standards with which I agree about the necessity for standards, even though we have raised some concerns about how they're done. Standards should surely be the main concern, Mr. Speaker. What does it matter if the standards are being met whether the care is being provided by the private sector, by the state or by nonprofit voluntary organizations? The responsibility of the Government should be to deal with the standards and see that those standards are met wherever the care is provided.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that in approaching the issue the Government doesn't limit the availability of day care through injecting some sort of ideological concern that they have into the overall issue. Look at the requirement there is for day care; set the standards openly; provide the funding that is necessary and don't be concerned so much with where the care is provided.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Pembina, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, would you call Bill No. 27, please?

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion by the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 27, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act. (Stand).

The Acting Government House Leader.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, would you call Bill No. 33, Mr. Speaker?

**BILL NO. 33 - AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT
RESPECTING THE ASSESSMENT
OF PROPERTY
FOR TAXATION IN MUNICIPALITIES
IN 1981 AND 1982**

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, An Act to amend an Act respecting the Assessment of Property for Taxation in Municipalities in 1981 and 1982.

The Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to make a few comments with respect to Bill No. 33 and, to say the least, I am concerned about this bill particularly in its main thrust, the indefinite time frame for the extension of the assessment freeze. In my opinion, the freeze should be no longer than absolutely necessary and no way should we be extending it beyond the end of 1983. This would be in keeping with the Assessment Review Committee's recommendations.

I would just like to refer to page 81 of the "Fair Way to Share," a summary report of the Manitoba Assessment Review Committee. The Assessment Review Committee recommended two alternatives for the implementation of their recommendations. Alternative No. 1 suggested that it would require a continuation of the freeze until December 31, 1987. However, the Committee did not feel that they could recommend or suggest that we proceed with alternative No. 1 and they recommended alternative No. 2, which would mean the freeze be extended to December 31, 1983.

As everyone knows, I'm sure, the Assessment Review Committee was appointed in July of 1977 and the Committee conducted very extensive meetings throughout the province. They met with all of the municipalities on one or more occasions. They also met with many individuals and several organizations that were interested in making presentations to the Assessment Review Committee. The final report was presented to the Minister some three months ago. To say the least, I have been astonished at the lackadaisical approach by the Minister in dealing with the report and its recommendations. I think it is fair to say that the Assessment Review Committee was appointed by the previous administration and if the present Minister

is not happy with the recommendations that Committee has brought forth, the Minister should either scrap it or get on with whatever the government feels that it can live with or support.

The Municipal Advisory Committee, which is made up of representatives from the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, representatives from the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities and also representation from the Municipal Secretary-Treasurers' Association, have offered the Minister assistance in coming to some position with respect to implementation of the recommendations in the Committee's report. Personally, I do not see anything wrong with the Minister's suggestion that an all-party legislative committee be established, but this should be done and this Committee should be ready to do their work as soon as the current Session is finished.

The 1980 legislation or, as it was referred to, Bill No. 100, Freezing Municipal Assessments for the Year 1981 and 1982, was undertaken only after much consideration. I know that I had, as Minister of Municipal Affairs at the time, given very serious consideration to whether or not we could really have the assessments frozen for this period of time. I know that there was much consideration given by caucus before the go ahead was given to proceed with Bill No. 100 back in 1980.

I think that we must not lose sight of the fact that the freeze is compounding the many inequities that exist in property assessments throughout the province and also in the City of Winnipeg and every day adds to this problem. The bill, as printed, could allow the Minister to dillydally at his convenience like he has done today. We must not unduly delay the freeze already in place and by passing a bill that freezes assessment indefinitely at this point in time, in my opinion, is neither necessary nor acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, the main thrust of the bill, of course, is to freeze the assessments in the province indefinitely and, as I have mentioned, there's no way that I can accept this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Pembina, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 42?

BILL NO. 42 - THE EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education, Bill No. 42, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.
The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill affords me an opportunity to express a few concerns that I have with this type of legislation. I appreciate that this bill has been brought in for administrative convenience so that the colleges, universities and other instructional institutions can receive a payment directly from the government without the government having to issue a cheque to the individual who is receiving a bursary.

However, Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that I believe we've had in society over the last little while is these automatic sort of checkoffs where the individual never gets to see the monies that he or she is receiving, or in many cases giving up. It has been expressed by my colleague, the Member for Lakeside, on a number of occasions and I'd just like to repeat some of those concerns and that is when one takes a position like this, we really do take some of the responsibility away from the individual to look after his or her financial affairs.

An area, which of course is close to all of us, is the automatic deductions that take place from the wage earner on a fixed income when he or she receives the cheque at the end of the month or a bi-monthly cheque, the income tax is taken off, the unemployment is taken off and the Canada Pension is taken off, all the deductions are made, and the person then receives a cheque which represents the net figure for his or her labours.

The problem with that, Mr. Speaker, is that many people never bother to look at the kind of deductions that have been taken. It has been suggested, and I think it might be a very good suggestion, for the governments at all levels to at one time say to the employers and to people who are on a fixed salary, that what we're going to do for three months is we will not make any income tax deductions, or unemployment deductions, or Canada Pension deductions, and we will after three months, bill you for those. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that would heighten the interest and heighten the concern by the average citizen of where his or her tax dollar was being spent, because what it would really do is to drive home the point that unemployment was costing them something - the Unemployment Insurance - the Canada Pension was costing them something, and it would really drive the point home to what extent income tax was biting into their pockets. I think it would make them a little more responsible to ensure that government mismanagement and government waste was checked up on.

Now, I realize that is a type of approach that would be virtually impossible to take because governments, of course, would run out of money very quickly, and I suggest that they would have an horrendous time trying to collect after people had already gone out and in very many instances spent that money. But it would, Mr. Speaker, drive home the point that nothing really in this society that governments do, is free and it would really make the point that we are all paying a very large share of our income to different government services, government agencies, and in many instances, as I have pointed out, people don't realize to what extent it's really affecting them because they never see the money, and it never passes through their hands. This is precisely my concern about this bill.

I think I know why the Minister is bringing it in. I

RESOLUTION - CROW RATE

think, as I mentioned earlier, the instructional institutions as well as the colleges and universities, are happy to see this, because if there is an individual who does receive a bursary and he or she doesn't pay that immediately to the university or to the institution, that will then mean that they will have to go after this person and try and collect it.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that these individuals who receive this money, part of their education is learning how to handle funds and if at this early stage in their life they are having difficulties in reconciling the bursary which has been paid to them and the payment thereof to the person that they're supposed to pay it to or that institution they're supposed to pay it to, I suggest that maybe this is the point in time where there should learn a lesson with regard to what is entailed when you don't pay your debts.

On the other side of it, it is also, I believe, an opportunity for them to really see physically, to actually see that cheque and realize what the Manitoba taxpayer is putting out for them. When it becomes a computer transfer, it becomes so abstract that nobody really understands or really appreciates the amounts that are involved. It just becomes a credit or a debit on your tuition or whatever.

So I say to the Minister I realize that it's sort of a housekeeping thing, and it's an administrative thing, but I think we're sliding into that with too many things where we have automatic checkoffs where the individual really doesn't have control and the responsibility to look after it. I don't think, in the final analysis, that helps strengthen the system at all.

So, Mr. Speaker, having said those few words, I want to say that I'm glad the bill has afforded me the opportunity to make those few remarks and we'll see what happens in Committee with regard to the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, Mr. Speaker, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. S. USKIW: Bill 43. Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education, Bill No. 43, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. (Stand)

MR. SPEAKER: The Acting Government House Leader.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, would you call the adjourned debate on the resolution, page 6?

MR. SPEAKER: On the adjourned debate on the resolution and the proposed amendment thereto by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I want to say I certainly have enjoyed taking part in this debate. I have a number of points that I have not made with respect to the resolution that's been proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. I've certainly made my points with respect to what I thought of the resolution and the Conservative Party's amendment.

I wish to place on the record as well, a number of what I believe are myths, if one can put it that way, that exist with respect to the Crow rate in terms of the arguments that have been and are being made and I'm sure will be made in the next number of weeks and months as the pressure continues to do away with the statutory provisions and protection for western farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned to the honourable members the other day, I was surprised in this resolution that the Wheat Board has already achieved and surpassed targets of transporting grain to our seaports and we didn't hear anything from the honourable members opposite. The only thing that we've heard from honourable members is when there is some dispute, so they can pit a producer against worker in terms of the negotiations at ports and the like, but they didn't commend the Wheat Board and the transportation system for already achieving the historical limit and pass the historical record of grain shipments to the ports. In fact we will exceed that with approximately seven weeks to go, substantially.

Mr. Speaker, as well we haven't heard from the Opposition - the group that was favouring embargoes to the Soviet Union - and I want to say here today I am very pleased and I want to congratulate the Canadian Wheat Board and the Government of Canada for negotiating what appears to be, I believe, one of the largest grain sales in history to the USSR. I say on a personal side, I hope that the use of embargoes doesn't stand in the way of those shipments of grain as were advocated by members on my right side whenever they supported their government in Ottawa with respect to the embargoes. Farmers of Manitoba and farmers of Western Canada sorely need cash flow and incomes at reasonable prices, and these grain sales I hope will add and assist farmers in moving the grain that they've got.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I haven't hit the point that I wanted to make with respect to the myths, we haven't heard from the Conservatives in this House at a time at least acknowledging that the system is capable of performing, provided the railways address themselves to the issue of movement, because they haven't. We all know that they've held the farmers up to ransom over the last number of years - and I don't want to use that word and take away from the Member for Turtle Mountain - but the fact of the matter is they've held the farmers of Western Canada with a gun to their head, Mr. Speaker, in effect. Mr. Speaker, we have as a public in Canada poured in hundreds of millions of dollars in assistance to the railways when it was their obligation to provide transportation, and it was their obligation under the present statute to do so and they neglected to do so. So now we want to say well, let's forget about the statute, let's go on, let's let the railways off the hook and let's change the Crow rate, let's

have the farmers pay more, Mr. Speaker, because basically that is the Tory resolution. It becomes so wishy-washy, Mr. Speaker; that is basically the Tory resolution.

Mr. Speaker, what are the myths behind the Crow rate? That the Crow rate is an obstacle to increase main line capacity in the western rail system. That has been primarily one of the keys of the Ministers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Pembina on a point of order.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could identify the document that he's quoting from and refer it to the House as to who printed it and where it came from.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, we have some of these on our own, but I will quote from the document, and the member I'm sure has a copy of it. The document was published by the Government of Saskatchewan. —(Interjection)— Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Which Government of Saskatchewan?

HON. B. URUSKI: Well, certainly not the new Government of Saskatchewan. The former Government of Saskatchewan was the Government of the Day on dealing with the Crow issue, Mr. Speaker, published by the authority of Gordon MacMurchy, the Minister of Agriculture in the former NDP Government of Saskatchewan; that's whose document . . .

MR. B. RANSOM: Has gone to its just reward.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. You know, I guess from time to time that will happen to all of us, whether it happens with the electoral process or by some other means. In fact, Mr. Speaker, and I don't say this lightly, some of our members today of course on a sad note are attending the funeral of one of our colleagues and we all will eventually day by day reach that stage, as I said, whether it be through the electoral process — because as days go by we all get older. We all get older every day of the year no matter how we address it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I spoke about the Crow rate as being the obstacle to increase main line capacity in the western rail system. Primarily the essence of the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition when he moved the amendment because he wanted to talk, he talked about the totality of the system and basically that's what he was saying that look, in order for us to have a more expanded system, we've got to get rid of the Crow. We have to get rid of the Crow because we want to expand the system, even though the figures that are produced by the railways themselves point out that increased capacity will be required to the West Coast, which virtually none of our grain with the exception of oilseeds, none of our Board grains, Mr. Speaker, move to the West Coast, and virtually no benefits or very minute benefits will accrue in terms of increased jobs and increased expansion of agricultural products or expansion in agriculture, very little will accrue to the people of Manitoba. His statement say-

ing that yes, get rid of the Crow in effect; that is how I interpret his statements, Mr. Speaker. I have said that is, in my opinion, the essence of the Leader of the Opposition's thrust. —(Interjection)— Well of course, Mr. Speaker, when you say it.

So, Mr. Speaker, even though we know that the percentage of grain moved on the main line to the West Coast will be decreasing over the years - in fact, every year from now on until the turn of the century the percentage of grain as it relates to the total load haul will decrease, decrease and decrease. So the fallacy of the argument that the Crow is an obstacle to the increased main line capacity on our western rail system is really a myth, Mr. Speaker. That capacity would have to be there regardless of whether we shipped an additional bushel of grain or not. In fact, if the farmers of Western Canada did not ship any more grain to the West Coast, we would still have to build that increased capacity in the main line.

Mr. Speaker, when would we have to build it? It depends on what priorities the railway system put on the commodities that they haul. The fact of the matter is that's been the argument all along that they have refused to move the grain; they have refused to upgrade boxcars; they have refused to upgrade branch lines; they have refused to buy locomotives unless there was money poured in from the public treasury. So we have poured in as a nation money into branch lines, into hopper cars, into locomotives, Mr. Speaker. We have done all these things and the railways say that isn't enough, we want more.

Mr. Speaker, what we have said is that if we are to put more money into the railway capacity, we should take a share in that system based on the monies that we put in. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, we really effectively don't own one, Mr. Speaker, in the way that railway is being operated; but we have given in exchange to the private rail basically all that they own today and it has become the largest conglomerate in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, as far as we are concerned and we have said this before, it is the responsibility of the railways to carry grain at the rates set by the Parliament of Canada. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to see that the railways live up to their obligation. They have not done that. Now we are prepared to put it on the table and renegotiate it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Government of Canada could tell them, you are not hauling the grain, give up your Charter. You are losing money, give up your Charter. Just as simple as that, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— Then we do take charge of the money that we have put into those railways, finance them, do what is necessary and make them a true public utility for the people of this country, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— No, you don't have to expropriate them.

They have not, Mr. Speaker, lived up to their obligations. We have put in money into the railways and we have not got anything out for it, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— Have we taken any equity in the railways for the monies we have put in? There was an obligation for the railways to move our grain, Mr. Speaker. There was an obligation. We gave them grants; we gave them millions of acres of land; we gave them millions of dollars, Mr.

Speaker. —(Interjection)—

The Member for Pembina says, aw, come on. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's been the argument - let's forget about that agreement - that's basically been the whole argument. Let's forget about history; let's forget about the agreements; let's start afresh; that is really what the Conservatives are, Mr. Speaker. They want to forget about everything and let's put a new system into place, Mr. Speaker. That is really where the Conservatives are. They want to subtly really put their friends, their voters and the voters of this province on the line. They are really putting them on the line, Mr. Speaker. They are putting them on the line because their resolution is about as wishy-washy as one can put it, so that no one —(Interjection)— absolutely, Mr. Speaker.

I intend to vote against the Tory resolution. I said that the first time I got up to speak, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition asked me, am I going to vote against it? I intend to vote against this amendment, Mr. Speaker, absolutely. I do not intend, as a member of this Assembly, to put myself in a position of being as wishy-washy and opposed, if I might say, Mr. Speaker, because really what you are doing is you are putting the farmers of Manitoba on the line by this. You really don't want to put your money where your mouth is, Mr. Speaker. Why didn't you amend the resolution and say, let's put the Crow on the table, let's negotiate it away, let the farmers pay more, but subtly you are saying that, Mr. Speaker, in this resolution.

We don't know whether the \$600 million that the Federal Government has put in subsidies now will remain. Is that what we call the historic benefit, Mr. Speaker? We don't know from the Leader of the Opposition whether that is. I mean, those words are so very nicely couched that they can be taken either way, depending on which side of the issue you want to be or which crowd you speak to, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition can get up in a crowd and say we said we want to protect the historical benefits; but, Mr. Speaker, that is the subtlety.

What will happen, Mr. Speaker, to that historic benefit when we are going to be shipping grain and increasing the grain supplies to 30 million tonnes? Will that same benefit then be watered down amongst all the producers? Will that benefit then go to all producers in this country, Mr. Speaker? Will that benefit go to other than grain producers, Mr. Speaker, because the Member for Arthur certainly supported that concept at least, a former Minister of Agriculture. I haven't heard the Leader of the Opposition, what his position is there. He maybe wants —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, one of these days I will be back there. There is no doubt about it. The Leader of the Opposition said to me, back to feeding turkeys, Mr. Speaker. I want to tell him yes, I will be back there someday. It may be sooner than I think, absolutely, Mr. Speaker, but it certainly won't be on this issue. It certainly will not be on this issue. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that I will be prepared to stand anywhere on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, do the Conservatives believe that the Crow rate is an unfair transportation subsidy, because we're not sure? I'm asking them. I want to know, Mr. Speaker, whether it's an unfair subsidy, because it's intimated —(Interjection)— well, the Member for

Pembina keeps saying get serious. I am very serious. The fact of the matter is this amendment is there only to try and get the Conservatives off the hook, Mr. Speaker; the chickens will come home to roost. The rates will not change overnight and the Conservatives at least want to be on record as at least saying well, we supported it.

What they supported, you know, it's like motherhood —(Interjection)— very unclear, very wishy-washy. Anyone could support, but no one would know what you stand for, Mr. Speaker. We all believe in motherhood, but the Conservatives really —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, we continually in this country and we have and will continually subsidize transportation in this country. We do it for airlines, we do it for roads, we do it for railways in terms of passengers, even though we cut them out and close off lines. We do it on the seaway, Mr. Speaker. We do in a whole host of areas; but now the one area that we are cutting back on and we want to say well, our new philosophy is the user-pay principle, really the Conservative philosophy. How can you argue? How can the Conservatives stand here when philosophically it is and has been truly the Conservative position that the user-pay principle shall be the policy in transportation matters.

Remember the bus fares, Mr. Speaker? What about the bus fares in the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker? Is that the new Tory philosophy? Let the rates go, forget about the benefits to this country in terms of the billions of dollars of revenue to this country based on the exports that the grain sales bring to this country, the balance of payments, Mr. Speaker, the jobs in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party is really whetted. They don't want to admit it because it's very delicate. In fact, their members are split, maybe not here in the House, but I venture to say that politically they have to be very careful.

I have to say really whether the Conservatives would have been in power in Ottawa or the Liberals makes no difference at this point in time, makes absolutely not one iota of difference in terms of what is happening with respect to the statutory rates on Crow, Mr. Speaker, not a bit. In fact now the issue has warmed up that now we had the M.P. for Lisgar indicating, the Member for Arthur indicating he's glad that now that there's a revision and let's do - Mr. Speaker, when the announcement was made that Gilson was appointed, the same Gilson who was the one-man advisor to the Conservative Party in terms of agricultural policy, that's basically the "bigness is goodness" policy, the Member for Arthur was very pleased that now the Crow is on the table we could resolve some of the issues in terms of getting to his preferences with respect to saying let's —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, that is his problem. The member isn't here to defend himself; that is his problem. In fact, he rose in this House and said that I will consider withdrawing it after the Speaker takes it under advisement. That's what the Member for Arthur said, and then under consultation from your leader, he backed off that position.

So, Mr. Speaker, the issue with respect to the Crow rate, that member - the former Minister of Agriculture - is on record as being very pleased that the revision is

being made because he wanted to and he has said that the benefits of the Crow should be distributed to the entire agricultural community; he has said that, Mr. Speaker. What does that mean? That means the subsidies that are there today. Well, Mr. Speaker, you check your member's records in terms of the radio statements that he made in Brandon and the like. I heard him, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— Oh, I would assume that members will rise in their place but, Mr. Speaker, basically the Conservative Party is and wants and in fact is very desirous that we get rid of the Crow rate. They don't want to be on the side at least publicly; they want to make their position as fuzzy as they can and that is the essence of this amendment, Mr. Speaker, to deal with ensuring that all Manitoba grain produced can be transported to market. We didn't hear them plaudit the Wheat Board when they've already surpassed. No, all they do is criticize, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, the sales are there, the commitments are there and if the railways dedicated themselves to transporting the grain as they are required to, which they haven't performed in the past, the members say pay them the money and they will perform. That is nonsense, Mr. Speaker; we have paid. We have paid through the nose to the railways and they haven't performed. That's really been the history of the railways in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the other area is and has been touted by members opposite, that if the Crow rate goes, we will have an expansion in livestock production and secondary processing and all kinds of great production. Both the Liberals and the Conservatives have said this. Mr. Speaker, that belies all the facts; that will not happen. The only time that increased production will occur is if there are adequate returns to producers in the marketplace, Mr. Speaker, and no marketing boards.

There we go, Mr. Speaker. Let's throw the producers to the wolves as we have done so historically in the cattle industry, in the hog industry, in all the industries. Who is suffering in terms of incomes in agriculture today? It is not the industries who have —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, it is not the people who have their incomes guaranteed on the basis of being able to supply the market that is there, not the fuzzy market that may or may not be. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, not the fuzzy market? What have we had in terms of historical conditions in terms of the livestock industry?

There has been a market, Mr. Speaker, at what price —(Interjection)— at what price? So why will we say that there will be an increased livestock industry in this country on the basis of getting rid of the Crow rate? It has no basis, Mr. Speaker, and that will not occur. It will occur, Mr. Speaker. At least now, the members of the Conservative Party are at the position that they admit that the market system doesn't work. Mr. Speaker, they at least now admit and they have to admit in the last number of years that it didn't work.

I mean, the former Minister of Agriculture was forced into bringing in and propping up the market for the hog industry and they were going to be forced to do the same thing for the beef industry. Maybe they wouldn't have, Mr. Speaker, but certainly with respect to this resolution, they are putting the farmers

to the wolves.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 4:30 and Private Members' Hour, when we next reach this resolution, it will stand in the name of the Honourable Minister.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Earlier today, I made an announcement about committee changes and as these things sometimes will, a previous change had not caught up with me or I had not caught up with it and we would end up with one extra member on the committee. I announced the replacement of the Minister of Consumer Affairs by the Member for Inkster and that will no longer be necessary or wasn't necessary then because the Minister of Consumer Affairs is not a member of Law Amendments. I'm just correcting that on the record.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. On the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River East, Bill No. 35, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Niakwa. (Stand)

SECOND READING - PRIVATE BILLS

BILL NO. 24 - AN ACT TO GRANT ADDITIONAL POWERS TO F.G. HOLDINGS LTD.

MR. D. SCOTT presented Bill No. 24, An Act to Grant Additional Powers to F. G. Holdings Ltd., for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This matter was brought before my attention a couple of months ago and I volunteered to bring forward a bill to the Legislative Assembly to correct a problem or to enable the F.G. Holdings Ltd., which is the Fort Garry Curling Club located at 51 Main Street, to enable them to make changes to their Act which will assist them in providing the basic services that the corporation is designed to provide, in other words, run itself.

What has happened since the corporation was first incorporated in 1927 with an authorization of 600 common shares at a par value of \$25 each, there have been issued approximately 435 common shares. The problem facing the corporation today is that of the 435 common shares outstanding, there are more than 200 held by persons whose whereabouts are not known. What we are attempting to do with this bill that is being brought before us today is to give them permission to amend their charter so that they will be able to meet their quorum measurements and therefore be able to hold meetings of the corporation.

A number of shareholders have died and the administration of their estates has obviously made no

attempt to transfer the shares to the heirs of the deceased shareholders. The difficulties and expenses in tracing through the estates of the various deceased shareholders to find their shares would be tremendous. The corporation has, over the years, made many efforts to try and locate the whereabouts of shareholders that they have not been able to get in touch with and have just found this impossible. They are getting down to the limit now where they won't even be able to hold a quorum. They won't even be able to dissolve themselves because of not being able to attract a sufficient number of members or find an additional number of members to their directors' meetings and their shareholders' meetings.

Any further delay, Mr. Speaker, in us acting on this bill would only increase the problems faced by the corporation because, as time goes on, more members move or more members die and fewer people will then be eligible or available to come to the shareholders' meetings. —(Interjection)— Primarily because of age, I would say. Mr. Speaker, what we are providing for within this bill is for the corporation to levy an assessment against each of the issued shares in the corporation and to cancel any shares in respect of which the assessment is not paid.

This would assist them in two purposes. First off, those who have died or who have moved and are not interested in keeping up with the corporation, the actual number of - one could say, I guess - living shareholders or interested shareholders could be identified, their records therefore updated. The amendments to this Act basically are the same ones that have been given for three other golf and country clubs in the past: the Rossmere Golf and Country Club in 1969, the Thistle Curling Club in 1978, and in 1980 the Charleswood Curling Club. So really we're just asking for a repetition of measures that have been taken in the past to get other community organizations, curling clubs and golf clubs out of predicaments in which they now find themselves.

There has been one section added to this bill which did not come in the previous bills, but it gives the shareholders up to one year to come forward and identify that they do have an interest up to one year has passed, and if they may be reinstated as full shareholders with payment of the required assessment.

With those brief notes, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend to the House that this bill now go forward into committee so that we can pass it before the end of the Session.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 34 - AN ACT TO INCORPORATE THE MENNO SIMONS COLLEGE

MR. R. DOERN presented Bill No. 34, An Act to Incorporate The Menno Simons College, for

Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill has the active support, backing and leadership of Dr. David Friesen, A.J. Thiessen, Dr. Gerhard Lorenz and Henry Redekopp. The intention of the bill is to establish a Mennonite Liberal Arts College to be known as the Menno Simons College, probably in the City of Winnipeg and probably affiliated with the University of Manitoba or the University of Winnipeg. The objects of this new liberal arts college would be fourfold:

(1) To provide an institution for the education of students and the promotion of knowledge according to the principles of the Mennonite religion. The orientation of the college would be religious in the Mennonite and Christian context.

(2) To provide a liberal arts education which would be of superior quality.

(3) To provide a focused and unifying curriculum including a variety of academic disciplines.

(4) To have the power to grant degrees including honorary degrees, diplomas, and certificates of standing in theology and divinity.

Mr. Speaker, the two major Mennonite Conferences in Manitoba support and would be involved in the establishment of a Mennonite Arts College and other Mennonite groups would be invited to participate with representation on the Board of Governors.

Now a number of questions probably come to mind and I would like to provide some information to members of the House in that regard. As I said the location is still not decided. This is a bill to enable the supporters of this concept to go out and raise money and make plans for the establishment of this college. This will obviously take some time to bring about. So the precise location is yet to be determined. The starting date would probably be about five years from now, but nevertheless the machinery has to be put in motion. Registration would have to be made and fund raising begun in order to bring this about and, of course, would probably involve the construction of some new buildings and facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I asked a number of questions of the people involved in this project. They would, of course, have no hesitation in opening the doors to people of all faiths, although it would be predominantly Mennonite in character. There is a great deal of interest in terms of providing an education that would also feature a background and training in terms of international development. We now have a situation in Manitoba where there are a number of Bible Colleges, but they predominantly focus or concentrate on theology and music; this would be for the establishment of a liberal arts college. I think that the concept, rather than perhaps being competitive or something to that effect, would likely be a unifying or synthesizing force in the Mennonite educational field. We all know that in Winnipeg there is a Canadian Mennonite Bible College, I believe it's in Tuxedo or Charleswood, Shaftesbury Boulevard. There is in my own riding the Mennonite Brethren Bible College which is well known.

There is the Steinbach Bible College and there is also the Winnipeg Bible College at Otterburne, Manitoba. So this would in effect be a fifth college that would have an affiliation with the other groups and might in the long run be the unifying force in terms of this particular association of colleges.

Mr. Speaker, before I agreed to pilot the bill, which I was asked to do, I spoke to the Minister of Finance, the Honourable Vic Schroeder. I also spoke to the Minister of Education, the Honourable Maureen Hemphill, who checked it out as the Minister of Education would be required to determine its acceptability and she gave her approval. I know there are members in the Conservative Party who are particularly interested in this bill and are members of the Mennonite community and I expect their wholehearted support of the measure.

Another point I suppose that might be considered is whether it's necessary or desirable to establish such a college. I point out by way of comparison that United College is affiliated - well, I guess it's not United College any more, it was when I went there —(Interjection)— that is a long time ago, but even longer than that it was Wesley College, and now it's the University of Winnipeg But United College was, of course, closely affiliated with the United Church and I guess still is and still turns out theologians of, I suppose, the stature of Stanley Knowles, who has been much affiliated with that college and university. St. John's is, of course, associated with the Anglican Church and St. Paul's with the Roman Catholic. St. Andrews, I'm not as certain of, Greek Orthodox —(Interjection)— no, not Lutheran, but St. Andrews College, of course, is on the campus of the University of Manitoba as well. So there are a number of colleges affiliated with churches and affiliated with the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, the supporters of the Menno Simons College are pledged to meet all government standards and more than that, to surpass what is the basic requirement. They are particularly interested in the field of international development and relations because of the longstanding historical interest of the Mennonite community in doing missionary work and in helping people who are underprivileged in Third World countries. This would be a pioneering institution; it's not going to simply be engraved in stone, it's going to be one that will develop and evolve according to the needs of the Mennonite community and the changing conditions in the province, the nation and the world.

Mr. Speaker, I simply conclude by making a few other points, that it will be different than the other Mennonite institutions in the province today, that it will not hinder or compete with them, but will complement the other organizations, that it is supported by the two main conferences.

Mr. Speaker, I have found it an honour and a privilege to be asked to introduce this legislation. I have also found it a pleasant experience to work with Robert Friesen, who is in the gallery today, who is the young lawyer who is working on this project. I simply say that I have had the pleasure of working with the Mennonite community before in 1974, and prior to that I worked with Dr. Lorenz and other people to bring about the erection of a bronze plaque in this

particular building to commemorate the 1874 to 1974 Centennial of the Mennonite settlement in Manitoba.

Members might be interested in looking again at the plaque, which is at the south entrance of the building, which features a family, a plow, a Bible and some wheat, which was put up by the Manitoba Mennonite Historical Society. The inscription on the plaque is: "We came, we toiled, God blessed." I cannot help but think, Mr. Speaker, what sharp contrast that is to the words of Caesar, who said, "I came, I saw, I conquered."

Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure to work with the Mennonite community at that time, and I was later honoured by being made an honourable life member of the Manitoba Mennonite Historical Society in the following year. I remember well working with the people at that time, and Premier Schreyer, myself and others gathered around there to unveil that particular plaque.

So, Mr. Speaker, I recommend and commend the bill, which is An Act to incorporate the Menno Simons College in Manitoba and recommend it to members on all sides of the house.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

RES. NO. 8 - FEDERAL REPORT ON WIFE BATTERING

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Kildonan, the Honourable Member for Wolseley has 10 minutes remaining.

MS M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I last addressed this resolution on June 7th, I left off by talking about some myths and misconceptions about battered women. In Canada there are 11,668,000 women. As we were saying when we last spoke on this resolution, one out of ten women find themselves battered in Canada every day, which means every day there are 1,166,800 women battered. So, since the last time we discussed this 10 days ago, there have been 11,668,000 beatings of women. To me, those are staggering numbers and every day when you think that another million-and-a-half women are being beaten in this country, I think it is fitting to talk about the misconceptions that we have about wife abuse.

The first one that I mentioned at the end of the time last June 7th was that most women like being beaten, or deserve it. It's our understanding that women stay in abusive situations not because they like being beaten, but because they see no economic alternative and that many battered women have no financial resources or few of their own available to allow them to leave, beyond their husband's income. But the idea of wives deserving to be beaten is just another attempt to place the blame on the victim.

The second myth is that battered women are passive and submissive, that any woman with any guts or

a mind of her own would not stand idly by and allow this to happen to her. But the research shows that women who find themselves in battering situations are no more passive or submissive than any other women. In fact, often, they are women who do try to assert themselves in a situation where men seek to dominate. These men, feeling threatened by their wife's desertion, respond then through violence. Over time, these women may convince themselves that if they remain passive, these beatings will discontinue or stop.

The third myth, of course, is that the husband has the right to beat his wife. Marriage does not make it right for men to beat their wives. The law, religion and tradition may suggest that husbands have this right. However, the right that men feel they have to beat their wives comes from the social acceptance of the idea that men have that kind of authority.

The other myth is that the wife is to blame. Again, this is a "blaming the victim" strategy. This interfamily violence is said to occur when the victim verbally torments the aggressor mercilessly, usually by nagging which is a common phenomenon that we see in the cartoons about wives and that if a husband is tormented this way, well, what can you really expect her poor husband to do? This myth focuses all the attention on individual couples and their interaction patterns. When one considers that one in 10 couples in Canada experience violence, it's necessary to look beyond individuals. It is no longer a situation where it's just this poor individual who has been nagged to the point where he physically assaults his wife. In fact, a British study found that 77 percent of battered women interviewed reported that physical assaults were usually not preceded by verbal arguments at all.

The other myth is that only certain kinds of women get battered. The only thing certain about victims of wife-battering is that they are women. There is no such thing as a battered wife syndrome; there are no stereotypes, no typical cases. To say that any particular kind of woman gets battered is again to place the blame on the victim.

The other excuse that is used is that wife beaters are mentally ill. Hardly. Wife beating is not a sickness, it's a crime; and to call it a sickness or excuse it as a sickness is to say that a man is not responsible for his violent behaviour. Wife beating is an inappropriate and unacceptable way of dealing with conflict. Wife beating is assault and it is estimated that only 3 percent - and I think the Member for Kildonan referred to the fact that 3 percent of men who beat their wives had any kind of emotional psychotic problems.

The other one is that wife beating is a private family matter. Saying that wife beating is a private matter between husband and wife places the family outside the rules and laws that prohibit violence and protects its victims. Considering family violence as a private matter gives police, courts, social service agencies the right to ignore the problem.

Violence against women is reality. For centuries husbands have been beating their wives systematically in order to dominate, punish and control them. Husbands have used violence to coerce their wives into behaviours that they may have been unwilling or unable to undertake, to punish them for failing to live up to marital demands and expectations, or simply as

a prerogative of the husband's superior position. Men have used violence in their attempt to control over their female possession, to retain personal authority, and to gain her personal services and domestic labour.

This has not been done in isolation from the wider community, nor in opposition to the general principle of acceptable behaviour, quite the contrary. Wife beating has always had strong ideological and institutional support, both in its own right and relative to the patriarchal relations within the family and throughout society. Likewise, violence against women has been and continues to be supported by our culture, not only in its blatant form, but also as a fact of every day life, in movies, advertising, popular music, pornography and television.

If wife battering is ever to be significantly reduced, the structure, practices, traditions and belief which keeps women dependent and isolated within the family and which keeps the family outside the legal and public censure, those traditions must be erased.

Long range prevention requires three basic types of programs; education, research and economic independence of women. Wife beating should no longer be defined as a woman's private dilemma. Wife assault should be seen as a community and public concern.

A helpful analogy is the way in which neighbours rally to lower speed limits when a child is injured by a speeding car on a residential street. The injury is not seen as the child's private dilemma, nor as the private problem of the parents, but the concern of the entire community.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before commencing my remarks on this Resolution, I would like to commend and thank the Member for Kildonan for bringing this Resolution before the House. I must say that when I set out to research this, I wondered where on earth I would find material and I find that I have briefcases and desks full of material. I don't think there is any shortage of material on this subject.

The subject of wife battering is not new to society. It has been with us for centuries. It is a subject so rooted in history and mythology and so ignored by the authorities for so long that it has become part of mythology, historical fiction, humour, drama and sad to say, part of a social pattern of many people today. We all have heard jokes and remarks at various times from various people on this subject. For those victims of this particular crime - and it is a crime - it is no laughing matter. Often, it is a matter of life or death.

One expert has suggested that there are as many reasons for battering as there are batterers. Researchers can find no common link which disposes one man to be a wife batterer and the other not. The book, "Wife Beating" by Langley states on Page 50 and I quote, "The answer to the question, what kind of a man beats his wife is, every kind, and they can be located in so-called normal families." On Page 7 of the same book, it states, "Those who work with battered women report victims among the wives of physicians, lawyers, college professors, even clergymen." In one

study referred to in the book, it was found that families with the most violence were those with highest incomes. There is another study which shows that the low income families are the more prone to violence. All this proves that there is no hard and fast rule as to who batters and who does not.

In the inquiry into the violence on the family, Donald Dutton from the Department of Psychology of the University of British Columbia states, "Studies suggest that 40 to 60 percent of men who assault their wives witnessed assault occurring in their family origin. They either saw their father assault their mother or they themselves were physically beaten by one of their parents. So early on they had role models that one way to deal with anger, one way to deal with stress, was to do so aggressively and to generate that aggression towards someone in the family." Of course someone in the family is naturally the closest to you and he went on later in his submission to state, "In some cases stress comes from within the family. It comes from a power struggle which is going on between the man and the woman." And further on in the brief, Mr. Dutton states, "Most men who become assaultive with their wives are relatively socially isolated; that is, they simply do not have a number of close friends with whom they can share their problems, or to whom they can talk about the stress that is going on in their lives."

A further reason I came across in my research was this, that some men have a need to feel superior. They feel inadequate in their business and their work or their friendships and social contacts. They go home and beat their wives in order to fulfill their longing for superiority. The old song, "You Always Hurt the One You Love," perhaps would fit into this theory.

Now, the question has often been asked, why do women continue to live with men who batter them or if they do leave, why do they return? The reasons for this are many and varied. On the surface it makes sense to say, why would anyone stay with someone who beats them? There are several reasons that I will deal with.

We're told that 40 percent of wife assaults take place during the time of a first pregnancy. So here we have a pregnant woman, battered and bruised, completely disillusioned, frightened and in no condition, either mentally or physically, to provide for herself or to provide for her child when it arrives. She returns to her home. After all, this has only happened once and he has said it won't happen again and after all she must believe him. By the time this does happen again and again, she is totally demoralized.

Mrs. Lewis, testifying at the inquiry into violence in the family on January 28, 1982 stated, "When the situation gets to the point where they realize that the beatings are not going to stop or quite often when it gets to the point of affecting their children, the women will generally try to make some effort to leave. The barriers that are put up against her when she reaches that decision are immense. So staying in the situation is more a function of those barriers than of any idea of her being passive and accepting the situation. Certainly, the kinds of financial resources that are available to her are very important. That is not only true for women who are not working outside the home, but also for women who may have worked outside the

home during the course of their marriage. One of the things that has been found in a number of studies is that really important factor in battering situations, is the fact that the woman has absolutely no control over the family's financial resources, whether or not she works outside the home. She may not have two nickels to rub together at the point where she makes the decision to leave, so quite often that becomes the first and the very large barrier that has to be overcome."

Another very important factor in the woman's decision to leave home is the fact that she has nowhere to go where she is safe. Crisis centres and the like are not always readily available and there is, in this province particularly, an inadequate supply of long-term stay transition facilities. Her family may be far away and if her family is nearby, they may not want to get involved in what they may consider a personal family problem. Perhaps they're afraid that their home will be disturbed by all these squabbles.

A further reason a woman is loath to leave home, even when battered, is pride. For instance, if she lives in a small town where everyone knows the family, a woman is reluctant even to ask for protection or leave her home because everyone in town will know about it. If her husband is a well-liked, highly respected member of the community, who will believe her?

Another reason, of course, why she may not want to leave home is that she may not want to lay assault charges against her husband because he is the breadwinner of the family. If he is charged with a criminal offence, he will lose his job.

Another factor which is sometimes forgotten when people talk about wife battering is the bond which exists between a couple. After all, she married him or consented to live with him. She perhaps genuinely cares for the husband who abuses her and she believes him when he assures her that it will never happen again.

Wife battering is probably more humiliating for the victim because it is done by someone she loves and shares her life with. If she were attacked and beaten by a stranger or even a neighbour, she could go to the police and complain, look what this terrible person did to me. But when it is her own husband, she's in an entirely different situation. Also, if she were attacked by someone else, she would have the help and support of her husband in seeking assistance. In the case of wife beating, the wife often has no one to turn to for help. Her family, if they were nearby, they might help but his family would certainly not likely be able to be counted on to help her.

Attitudes and public opinions do not always favour women in cases of wife battering. Women traditionally have been treated as the property of men, as chattels. In the past, mothers and grandmothers have contributed to the attitude that women are subservient to men, that men are superior and that women should serve and obey them. After all, the marriage vows said, love, honour and obey. Men have for centuries been considered to be more aggressive. More emphasis on physical strength and aggressiveness have been placed on male behaviour. Women were trained since childhood to be passive, obedient and inferior. Modern mothers would be well advised to teach their sons and daughters that aggression manifested by violence between couples is not the way to solve prob-

lems and that attacking and beating anyone is a crime, be it a stranger or a spouse.

Now we come to the age-old question of what we can do about this problem. It has been the experience over the years that the police are very loathe to deal with the problem of wife battering. In a report on violence in the family, wife battering, tabled in the House of Commons recently, the subject of police involvement was stated thusly, and I quote. This is on page 10 of that report. By the way, I highly recommend the reading of this report. I would really have liked to have just stood up and read this complete report into the records. It is a fine report. Anyway, back to page 10: "While police will almost always respond to break and enter calls, there's no assurance that they'll respond to domestic calls.

"Until very recently, police training and police practice with respect to the handling of domestic cases has not been directed at helping the victim so that even when the police do answer a call, there's little that they are able to do for the victim. They are often unaware of the existence or location of the services available to her, an emergency shelter where she can stay temporarily, legal aid, counseling, municipal welfare. They are ordinarily instructed not to arrest the batterer unless they find him actually hitting his victim - an unusual situation - or unless the injuries are severe enough to require a certain number of stitches.

"They have no other authority to take the batterer away and leave the wife and children in her home. In short, given the usual training and under usual practice the police are at best able to calm the batterer and leave the situation at that. And also on page 13, No. 23 I quote: "Throughout Canada it is usually police practice to screen out a good many domestic calls. It appears to be police policy either written or unwritten, not to arrest men accused of beating their wives or even to lay charges against them unless their partners' injuries are extremely serious. This leaves the process of initiating criminal proceedings to the person who is least capable of doing so, a woman who has been injured, who knows little of court procedure and whose actions may result in the criminal conviction of someone who is likely to seek out and beat her again."

In the recommendations of this report - I would like to refer to them, they are on page 19 of the report - while I agree in principle with the recommendations contained in the report on wife battering, there are a couple of remarks I'd like to make concerning them. First of all, in its reference to police, the report deals only with the RCMP. There are city and municipal police officers who should also be included in training and Recommendation 3 deals with affirmative action regarding hiring practices. It says, and I quote: "It should assign male-female teams to family violence cases."

Whereas the theory of that approach is quite sound, in practice it would appear to me to be very difficult. I'm particularly thinking of a small police detachment - and many of them are across our province - often they would be hard-pressed at busy times to send one police officer to a call let alone two and one of each sex, so I think that would be a very difficult thing to carry out in practice although I believe in theory it is a good idea.

Now, before concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker,

I'd like to lend my voice to those who have stated that there is a need for more crisis-centre housing both in Winnipeg, in other cities of this province and across Manitoba. Also, there is a great need for transition housing for women who must leave their homes and the welfare system must be in tune with the needs of a woman and her children in a crisis situation.

I'm prepared, Mr. Speaker, to support this resolution and I call all members of this Assembly to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like at this time to register my support for the resolution as presented. I have some problems in my own mind agreeing wholeheartedly, not so much with the operative clause of the resolution, but I wonder if it goes far enough, if it does all the things we would hope it would do. I'd like to say that some of the statistics that were brought forward by the Members for Kildonan and Wolseley were certainly overwhelming, so much so that I feel that obviously they've convinced me it's a society problem and as we're all part of society, we should all feel obliged to make comment. So obviously it's a crisis and I don't know if I can accept the statistics as given; on one hand, they seem to be so overwhelming and yet so hidden from so many of us, one is almost inclined to say that maybe they are stretched but even if they are, they're so overwhelming I think that you have to accept them, probably, as true. The other comments that batterers cut across all our economic and social lines; that I can readily accept.

All these things, Mr. Speaker, create a fair amount of confusion in my own mind as I attempt to grapple with it and say if there's a solution out there and surely we have to hope that there is one, what is the best approach to go. I'll say at this time that I can support some of the things that are mentioned by way of the operative clause in the resolution; I don't deny any of them but I really wonder if they go far enough. So accepting the statistics and the numbers, I have to ask myself a lot of questions and, no doubt, everybody would. The first question I ask myself is, what does it say about our way of life? As a nation and as a people, are we progressing at all? I have a colleague who will say to me that, in his view, really society or civilization as we know it maybe really hasn't progressed that far and I guess I'm to the point after listening to this, I can almost believe that. If in fact, we can't be civil to each other behind closed doors for whatever reason, I again ask where are we going, are we progressing at all, and where are we headed? Is this problem going to continue to become worse in spite of all the attempts? I see bills and I see legislative attempts to guarantee everybody rights, to guarantee the right to that 99th and 100th percentile of our population now that some people don't have them. Yet galloping from behind you have, by these figures, 10 percent of the population whose rights are being overwhelmed and violated. It also makes me ask myself, what have the more lenient social norms and possibly the courts that we have within the so-called free western world, what has it really done for us?

In conclusion, I'm wondering if we are really freer today in all aspects in spite of our bills and our charters and our Constitution guaranteeing personal privi-

leges or rights. So those are some of the things that go through my mind as I attempt to grapple within myself, to try and come out and make some rationale to this whole problem. I have some beliefs. I believe first of all that this problem, even though I recognize fully well is not something new; it's something that's probably been with us for the ages. In my mind and I can't substantiate this and, no doubt, there are statistics that maybe can prove me wrong, but until I see them I believe that in fact this problem is more severe today than it was generations ago.

When you see lots of statistics floating around, I'm wondering if somebody can show me how the Canadian experience fits into other free western countries and other countries in the world. Where do we rate? I can't imagine it being much worse than anywhere else than what seems to be existing here, or are we the worst? Because if we are, I think, that says something pretty dreadful about the way we've allowed ourselves to progress in this sense. Of course, no doubt, maybe there is no real way of comparing; maybe the techniques of comparing or gathering this type of information just aren't available to allow that type of comparison.

Again though I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that in fact if the statistics in Canada are worse to my way of thinking, then our problem as a nation is such that I believe we have to address it in a most severe way. I wonder if in fact part of our problem is that we've relaxed some of our laws to the degree that we're afraid to punish - and I don't want to be labelled necessarily and very quickly as somebody that feels that punishment is the solution to all problems - but in my mind I really do believe, particularly in this area, that there have to be some tougher laws and I'll speak more to that point a little bit further.

What can I support? I suppose if I draw any criticism at all from the resolution it's a fact that I don't see a strong emphasis made on stronger laws and maybe they exist - I don't know enough about this problem - maybe they're in existence right now and they're just not being enforced. Maybe they exist; I don't know, but if they don't I am one that would support much stronger laws to deal with them. I would support much stronger economic impositions on the batterers to support the spouse who now decides to escape the household and I can support that. Again, I want to tell you that I support certainly the person that's been abused in all respects, but only after that person - and of course let's say that woman because obviously that's the situation - has made the decision to leave, and obviously that's No. 1.

In my mind, jobs and funding and training and all that sort of thing are fine, but I believe that the person who commits the crime must pay a large share of the cost. I'm talking now in situations where that person doesn't go to jail but has the economic capabilities to pay the cost of doing the things that many of the recommendations are asking society to do as a whole. I guess what I'm saying is it can't be considered entirely a social problem, I mean, to the degree that all the problems or all the solutions have to be asked of government and I think that's all I'm trying to say. I think the person responsible has to assume an awful lot of the responsibility if he can and I realize, in many cases, he can't.

I realize that, because to say that in fact it's society's problem in totality and therefore it has to deal with it completely is to admit one thing - and I haven't heard anybody say that - was to admit that our society has failed miserably, it has failed miserably. I would submit that if in fact you reach that conclusion that it has failed, then you have to ask yourself the next question, well, has it been this way for generations, for hundreds of years or is it becoming a problem that is worse? If it's becoming worse over the last 20 or 40 years then obviously there's a cause, other than the underlying one that always seems to be there, it has something to do with the way we can or we can't live with ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, in review then, I haven't said very much that's going to help the debate but I'd just like to say that I'm not overly impressed with the recommendations that, in themselves, make reference to things like counselling. I read the recommendations of the report and I see things like counselling, funding, training, shelters, treatment programs, research, publicity and I honestly don't believe that if all these things came on that in itself would help the situation very much.

I think that society as a whole has to want to go out and say to the individual that commits a most horrendous crime that in fact you are going to have to pay severely. So the people that, in fact, do commit these awful crimes will realize or have some thought in the back of their mind at least to the potential consequences.

To me the only quick decision of a long-lasting nature are tougher sentences and if they're available now to be put into place, then I say they must be enforced; and much tougher monetary sentences, depending of course upon the violence of the crime. It's a dreadful problem. Again I am horrified, like the Member for Kildonan, at some of the statistics she's given to us but to my view the first decision must be made by the spouse to leave, that always has to be made firstly. Secondly, all the recommendations that seem to indicate it is society's total responsibility to have that support in place when she makes that decision, I'm saying, well, fine, I understand what you're trying to do but to my way of thinking, that in itself will not be the solution. It needs support. It needs more teeth from a law abiding society that is saying to those people who dare use their force against the rights of others, even behind the confines of a house that's co-shared, that you will have to pay severely.

So I think the resolution needs some further support in that manner and I guess I would conclude by saying, that the time for compassion for anybody that batters should be over.

So I support your resolution and I would have supported it with much more vigour had you included that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of members of our caucus who wish to speak on this very important resolution and I'm one of them, Sir. I don't particularly want to start with just two minutes remaining on the clock. May I call it 5:30?

MR. SPEAKER: It's the will of the Assembly to

call it 5:30.

The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that the House be now adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. (Friday).